THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH
OR THE
Siddhānta Dipikā and Agamic Review.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Search for Truth as revealed in the Ancient Hindu Mystic Philosophy known as the Śaiva-Siddhānta or Āgamānta.

VOL. XII. MADRAS, JANUARY, 1911. No. 7.

PURA-NĀNŪRU.

(Continued from page 251 of No. 6 Vol. XII.)

சோழன் கரிகாற் பெருவளத்தானைக் கருங்குழலாதனார் பாடியது.

களிறு கடை இயதாட்
கழலுரீஇய திருந்தடிக்
கணைபொருது கவிவண்கையாற்
கண்ணொளிர் வரூஉங் கவின்சாபத்து
மாமறுத்த மலர்மார்பிற்
றோல்பெயரிய வெறுழ்முன்பி
னெல்லையு மிரவு மெண்ணாய் பகைவ
ரூர்சுடு விளக்கத் தழுவிளிக் கம்பலைக்
கொள்ளை மேவலை யாகலி னல்ல
வில்லவா குபவா லியறேற் வளவ
தண்புனல் பரந்த பூசன் மண்மறுத்து
மீனிற் செறுக்கும் யாணர்ப்
பயன்றிகழ் வைப்பிற்பிற ரகன்றலை நாடே. (7)

To Karikāl Peru Vaḷattān, the Cōḷan,[1] *by Karuṅ-Kuḷal Ādanār.*[2]

With foot that urges on the elephant,—with leg that wears the hero's badge,—with hand that directs the arrow, and also dispenses gracious gifts,—with the bow that to the eye is resplendant with bright beauty,—with the flower-garlanded breast which

[1] See 65, 66, 224.

[2] The same bard sang the same hero's dirge. See 2241.

desiring the good goddess rejects all others,—riding forth in mighty strength on thy war-elephant,—night and day being both alike to thee,—thou dost delight in the din of destruction, the light of burning cities, and the wailings of the ruined and in their spoils. Therefore, O Valavan to whom belongs the well-built chariot! to the people of the land against whom thou makest war all good things shall become evil, and where there was prosperity there shall desolation reign! [3]

சேரமான் கடுங்கோவாழியாதனைக் கபிலர் பாடியது.

வையங் காவலர் வழிமொழிந் தொழுகப்
போகம் வேண்டிப் பொதுச்சொற் பொறாஅ
திடஞ்சிறி தென்னு மூக்கந் துரப்ப
வொடுங்கா வுள்ளத் தோம்பா வீகைக்
கடந்தடு தானைச் சேர லாதனை
யாங்கன மொத்தியோ வீங்குசெலன் மண்டிலம்
பொழுதென வரைதி புறக்கொடுத் திறத்தி
மாறி வருதி மலைமறைந் தொளித்தி
யகலிரு விசும்பி னானும்
பகல்விளங் குதியாற் பல்கதிர் விரித்தே. (8)

To Ceramān-Kaḍuṅkovāḻiyādan by Kabilar.

O Sun whose march is so majestic, how canst Thou be compared to Ceralāthan who goes forth hailed by the acclamations of rulers of the Earth, who desirous of enjoyment endures not equality, who regards his own land as too narrow for him, animated by lofty ambition, whose soul knows no remissness whose generosity knows no limit and whose armies go forth to conquer?

Thou art limited as to time, thou art compelled to make retreats, thou comest and goest, thou hidest thyself behind the hills, thou art seen in the wide firmament of heaven, scattering far and wide thy beams of light only in the daytime.

---

[3] This poem is peculiarly involved, but most vividly picturesque Compare 4 and 98.

பாண்டியன் பல்யாகசாலைமுதுகுடுமிப் பெருவழுதியை
நெட்டிமையார் பாடியது.

ஆவு மானியற் பார்ப்பன மாக்களும்
பெண்டிரும் பிணியுடை யீரும் பேணித்
தென்புல வாழ்நர்க் கருங்கட னிறுக்கும்
பொன்போற் புதல்வர்ப் பெறாஅ தீரு
மெம்மம்பு கடிவிடுது நும்மரண் சேர்மினென
வறத்தாறு நுவலும் பூட்கை மறத்திற்
கொல்களிற்று மீமிசைக் கொடிவிசும்பு நிழற்று
மெங்கோ வாழிய குடுமி தங்கோச்
செந்நீர்ப் பசும்பொன் வயிரியர்க் கீத்த
முந்நீர் விழவி னெடியோ
னன்னீர்ப் பஃறுளி மணலினும் பலவே. (9)

To Pāṇḍiyan Palyāga-sālai Mutu-Kuḍumi Peruvaḻudi by Neṭṭimaiyār.

May our king, KUDUMI, prosper, who thus utters the virtuous words of warning,[1] while in warlike bravery he goes forth on his death-dealing elephant, with banners displayed that overshadow the sky:

"Ye cows ;[2] ye Brāhmans of like sanctity ; ye women ; ye who are suffering from disease ; ye who have not obtained sons of priceless value, whose sacred duty it is to care for those who dwell in the Southern regions, performing on their behalf the prescribed rites ;—We are going to shoot out our swift arrows,—therefore hasten ye to your sheltering fortresses !"

---

[1] This, and many other songs in the Puranānūru, can only be understood by a reference to the *Puṟa-poruḷ Veṇbā-Mālai* ; and I would refer the reader to my article (VIII) in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, April, 1899. In this song, the king Kuḍumi is about to commence a cattle-raid, and he advances with his forces to surprise the owners of the castle. Before these have time to muster he utters the words of warning. When the warriors have assembled for defence the fight will begin ; meanwhile he is anxious that there should be no unnecessary bloodshed, either of cattle or of non-combatants. The bard commemorates king KUḌUMI'S virtuous observance of the rules of warfare.

[2] It is amusing that he addresses the cows, whom he already regards as his own, and would protect them, not only because cows are acred, but because he wants to drive them safe home after the fight.

May he prosperous reign, I pray, for as many years as there are grains of sand in the *Pal-tuḷi*[3] river, whose beauteous stream was caused to flow by that *Mighty-One*, who gave pure gold, righteously acquired, to the Minstrels that sought his presence; and who established the feast in honour of the Lord[4] of the Ocean's triple waters!

[[3] The *Pal-tuḷi* river,:—This means the 'river of many drops.' There are many wild stories about the 'Mighty-King' whose name was *Vaḍimbalamba-Ninṛān*; we shall return to these hereafter.

[4] This is Varuṇa. There seems some connection with the stories of the Cilappathigāram and Maṇi-Mēkhalai.]

THE RED LOTUS.

1. Lotus, tender flower
Of the crystal wave,
Whence thy magic power,
Say, for thou dost save
Anon from chilling thoughts dark Sorrow's wretched slave,

2. Young when Phoebus rises
Through the misty veil,
Under his flaming kisses
Thou dost blush and smile,
Like an approving queen with passion trembling frail.

3. Yet how coy and distant
To the languid moon,
Whose bloodless beams extend
To embrace thee soon
But thwarted by thy shrunken frown do pining swoon!

4. On the green and diamond
Paving soft thy floor,
Dance thou spirit Jocund,
Laughing evermore,
Dance, dance and laugh, for pain did never reach thy shore.

5. Like a naiad lovely
With her sister nymphs,
All the day full gaily
To celestial hymns,
Still dancing stately measures unwearied in her limbs!

6. As thy breath delicious
Overflows the air,
Heavenward-rising wishes
Free from guilt or care,
Inspire the soul till it sparkles as thy waters clear.

7. Sweet as is thy fragrance,
Holy, deep, serene,
Never sensuous joyance,
Wild and gross and keen
Thy pious petals breathe ; for godly is thy mien.

8. Like a saintly maiden
Clothed in purest thought,
Whom passions never madden
With vexations fraught,
Thy sister white communes with Heaven that reigns the peace she sought ;

9. Like a chaste-eyed star
Of the clear azure,
Sending from afar
Her tranquil beams and pure,
When clouds like evil thoughts do not her orb obscure.

10. Nature's heart unfolded
Shedding love and bliss,
Till the world be moulded
Into one soul of peace,
Where tenderness doth flow, and furies never hiss.

11. Sounds of war or strife,
Shaking souls that bloom
On the waste of life,
Do not yell their boom
To mar the sacred calm that reigns within thy home.

12. Music sweet unearthly
From thy presence rains,
Heard by mortals hardly
But when their spirit reigns
In ecstacy upraised from lulled corporeal trains.

A. S.

ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA—A STUDY.*

President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

In this short discourse of mine I do not propose to enter into anything like a discussion of the principles of Śaiva Siddhānta Philosophy, with a view to show its superiority over other schools of Indian thought. I only propose to give an outline of the same; so much as to make clear to a lay mind, what Śaivaism or Śaiva Siddhāntam is, and in what relationship it stands to other schools. Although this school of Śaiva Siddhāntam is, in the words of a late eminent scholar in Tamil, the oldest and choicest of Indian philosophies; it had so long remained in the back ground that even the term Śaivaism has ceased to be understood in its true meaning. It is only very few that know who a Śaiva is, and why he is so. It is no surprise then that many of us do not know what Śaivaism or Śaiva Siddhāntam is, and why it is so known. It may therefore be of advantage to begin this discourse with an examination of the definition of the terms Śaiva and Śaivaism.

2. I have already said that the term Śaiva no longer denotes what it ought to. It is used to denote a very narrow section of the Veḷḷāḷa community, who pass for hereditary vegetarians, and to which, I may say, I myself belong. At any rate it is so used in the southern part of this Presidency. A Brahmin, none the less a hereditary vegetarian, is not known as a Śaiva; nor is any other non-Vellāḷa. Even Vellalas that have become Vegetarians for the past few generations, are not accepted as Śaivas. What is still worse is, that the so-called Śaiva is Śaiva, even though he does not stick up to the Vegetarian diet. Indeed, it is no longer used as a name denoting the religion which one professes, but as one denoting the sub-caste he belongs to. It is not that the Vellāla section alone is responsible for this degradation in use.

* A lecture delivered by Mr. V. P. Kāntimatinātha Pillai, B.A., during the 6th conference, (Madras), December 1911 of the Śaiva Siddhānta Mahā Samājam.—*Ed. S. D.*

Brahmins call this section as Śaivas and think it as demeaning to be known by the name themselves; while the other non-Vellālas think, they are too low to be entitled to the name. Why! all of us know that in this town of Madras, there is a street known as Śaiva Muttaiya Mudaly street. The name implies that none of the Mudaliyārs outside the division of the said Mudaliyār, can possibly be or become a Śaiva.

3. What is the cause of this restriction in use? None of the scriptures sanction such. Śaiva Samaya Ācharyas the expounders of Śaivaism in South India are four in number. Of them three are Brahmins. Śaiva Santāna Āchāryas the expounders of Śaivaite philosophy in Tamil, are also four and three of these likewise Brahmins. Can it be that these are not Śaivas? Why! The former are worshipped as Avatārs for propounding Śaivaism and festivals in big Śiva temples are celebrated in their honour; and the latter also are worshipped as the propounders of Śaivaite philosophy. Again Śaivaism recognises 63 devotees or Nāyanmārs as they are called. Each caste from Brahmin to Paraya has its representatives among them. It must be that one and all of them are Śaivas. Nay, they are accepted as Śaiva Saints, deified and images representing them are worshipped in all Śiva temples by all castemen alike. Besides, Śaivāgamas, the Śaivaite Scriptures recognise six classes of Śaivaites, Ādi Śaiva, Mahā Śaiva, Anu Śaiva, Anantra Śaiva, Peravara Śaiva, and Antya Śaiva. The first two are among the Brahmins, the 3rd among the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas, the 4th among the high caste Sūdras, the 5th among the inferior Sūdras and the last among the Pañchamas. It is thus plain that the term Śaiva is not to be regarded as a term denoting one's Caste. It denotes one's religion and that alone.

4. Turning then to the etymological meaning of the term Śaiva, we see that it *prima facie* means a worshipper of Śaiva, as the only True God. Worship is of different modes, at different stages of one's religious life. Although the Hindu Scriptures one and all prescribe the various observances and practices which a true Śaiva ought to adhere to. They alone inculcate the various doctrines which distinguish the Śaivaite philosophy from the rest.

Hence a Šaiva is a follower of Šivāgamas. How then the term came to mean a hereditary Vegetarian? Abstinence from animal diet, is one of the various rules prescribed by the Šivāgamas. A Šaiva is bound to obey it as well as other rules prescribed by the Āgamas. Mere vegetarian diet cannot make one a Šaiva. A hereditary vegetarian Vellala who makes a breach in any of the rules of the Āgamas or who believes in a doctrine different from that inculcated in them, is equally a non-Šaiva. Again it is not enough if one belongs to a Šaiva family. He must himself be a close follower of the Šivāgamas. The moment, he departs from them, he becomes a non-Saiva. So also a non-Saiva becomes a Saiva as soon as he becomes a follower of the Āgamas. Thus we see that all the followers of the Āgamas, are Saiva and their religion Šaivaism, irrespective of their nation or caste or birth and all are entitled to become such. It is in this broad sense, our Saint, Šivajñānayogin has sung.

"சிவனென்று மொழியைக்கொடிய சண்டாளன் செப்பிடில்
அவனுடனுறைக அவனுடன் கலந்து பேசுக,
அவனோடருகிருந் துண்ணுக என்னும்உவமையில்சுருதி'!

The unrivalled Vedas declare:

"With him who recites the word Šiva, be he the worst Chaṇḍāḷa, one may freely converse, reside, and mess also by his side."

5. We shall now proceed to see what these Āgamas are. The word Āgama is interpreted in various ways. One of them is the following:—The *ā* sound in the word denotes Pāšam or Bondage, the *ga* sound denotes Soul or Jīva and the *ma* sound, the Pati or Lord. The Āgamas thus form the scriptures that treat of Pati, Pašu and Pāša or in other words, God, Soul and Bondage. The same are known as Pāšupatams as they treat of Pašu, its bondage, Pāša, and its lord Pati. These are of 2 classes Vaidika and Avaidika Pāšupatams. The former are consistent with the Vedas and the latter not. Saint Tirumūlar refers to this former class of Āgamas, when he says "வேதமோடாகமம், மெய்யாம், இறைவனூல்" According to him, the Vedas and the Āgamas are both of them true, both being the word of the Lord. Šri Nīlakaṇṭāchārya expresses the same view in his commentary

on the Pāšupata Adhikaraṇa of Brahma Sūtras. He does not perceive any difference between the Vedas and the Šivāgamas. The Veda itself is Šivāgama. This truth is inculcated in the 16th Adhyāya of the Pūrvabhāgam of Kūrmapurāṇa and in the 32nd Adhyāya of Yajña Vaibhava Khaṇḍa of Sūta Samhitā. It is the other class of Āgamas known as the Avaidika Pūšupatams, that are spoken of in deprecating terms in Vāyu Samhitā and such like, and the narrow-minded sectarians distort the meaning of the Vāyu Samhitā sloka and misapply it to the Sivāgamas beginning with Kamika. The Saivagamas are also attacked on the ground that they do not come under the list of eighteen Scriptures or vidhias as they are called. In fact, the Vedas and the Sivāgamas form but one Vidhia. It is of 2 parts, the general and the special. The same sentiment has been expressly said by Saint Tirumūlar in his elegant verse, part of which has been above quoted.

"வேத மோடாகமம் மெய்யா மிறைவனூல்
ஓதவும் போதவுஞ்சிறப்பு மென்றுன்னுக."

6. Where is the necessity then for 2 parts? Will not the special part of the Sivāgamas alone do? We see in our experience that our powers are altogether limited and we are gradually improving. We are not able to grasp things, all at once. We require to be instructed only by degrees. This mode of instruction is what is known in Hindu Logic as Sthūlaruntate Nyāya. Here is one who wants to see the star Arundhati. It is so minutely small as to become visible only after a steady, gradual, and continued practice. Give him the best of the descriptions and he cannot see it. Describe to him another star near the same but easily visible. Say to him that it is the self-same star he wants to see; else he will not care to see it. Once he sees it you may slowly lead him on to see another star which is nearer the true Arundhati and more visible than the former. In this way one may successfully lead him on to see the actual Arundati and to know also its peculiar features. The instruction given to us by our Lord through our Vedas and Sivāgamas is of the same mode. With the best of the descriptions therein, we are not able to know

the true God. We are first instructed to see such God in one or other of the five elements, the lowest and the most visible in the order of the 36 Tattvas. We are made to think for the time being that the deity presiding over the one or the other of them, Indra, Agni, Varuṇa or the like, is the true God. We are gradually taken to see Him in the higher Tattvas one after another and think that the deity presiding over the one or the other of them, Brama, Vishṇu, Rudra and so on, is the true God. The worship of each one of these deities forms a religion of its own. In the end we are instructed to see the true God Himself, in the Being that is above one and all the Tattvas. With this ends the general part. It is general, as it does not describe any one deity in particular. It on the other hand describes all the deities in general. Even when it describes the true God, it describes only His general features, so much as to enable one to distinguish Him from the lower Gods. His other features which form His peculiar ones and modes of worship peculiar to Him, are left to be described in the special part, the Sivāgamas.

7. We thus see that the special part is nothing contrary to the general one. On the other hand the latter leads on to the former. Hence the special part or the Sivāgamas is called Siddhāntam. The word Siddhāntam is of two components, Siddham, and Antam; both of which mean conclusion. The word as a whole means, the conclusion of conclusions. The religion of the Sivāgamas being such is known as Siddhāntam. All the other religions conclude in it; although among themselves one concludes in the other. Even the religion of the Upanishats, Vedāntas as they are called, concludes itself in this. It may therefore be taken to be the all-concluding religion. The other religions are but various steps, reaching to this one, one being higher than the other. An all-concluding religion is also an all-embracing one. It can never contradict any one of the other religions. On the other hand it embraces within its fold all the other religions. That this is the test of a true religion has been set forth in clear terms by Aruṇandi Sivam in the following verse of his Sivajñanasiddhi.

"ஓது சமயங்கள் பொருளுணரு நூல்கள் ஒன்றோ
டொன் றொவ்வாமலுள பலவுமிவற்றுள்
யாது சமயம் பொருள்நூல்யாதிங் கென்னில், இது
வாகுமதுவல்ல தெனும் பிணக்கதின்றி
நீதியினா னிவை யெல்லா மோரிடத்தே காணநின்றதி
யாதொரு சமயமது சமயம் பொருள் நூல்
ஆதலினாலிவை யெல்லா மருமறையாகமத் தேயடங்கியிடு
மவையிரண்டு மரனடிக்கீழடங்கும்."

Many are the religions and the scriptures teaching them. No one of these agrees with the other. How then to find which of these is true? That religion is true, which not contradicting this or that one, embraces every one of them within its fold. So also the scriptures teaching the same. All the other scriptures are covered by the Vedas, and Āgamas; while they themselves are covered by no other than the Lord's Grace.

8 Of the Vedas and Sivāgamas, the whole of the Vedas corresponds to the whole of the Sivāgamas. The Vedas are four in number and each one of them is divided into 2 parts, the Karma Kāṇḍa or the ceremonial portion and the Jñānakāṇḍa or the Philosophical portion. So also are the Sivāgamas. They are 28 in number. Each one of them is divided into four parts or pādams: Charyā, Kriyā, Yoga, and Jñāna pādams. The first three correspond to the Karmakāṇḍa of the Vedas and the last one, the Jñānapāda corresponds to the Upanishat portion of the Vedas.

The Upanishat portion is otherwise known as Vedāntam, and the Jñānapāda portion of the Āgamas as Āgamāntam. The latter is Siddhāntam with regard to the former. This relationship holds also with regard to the ceremonial portions of the two treatises. In Karmakāṇḍa, the various Dharmas or modes of worship directed towards deities of an order lower than the True God, are set forth in details. They are known as Paśu Dharmas. Although the mode of worship of the true God is also in a way treated therein, the same is treated in detail only in the Āgamas. No Āgamic Dharma is directed towards any other than the Lord

Siva. Rituals, domestic and these relating to the temples, rituals daily and these on special occasions, and the various mental practices, as set forth in the Sivāgamas, are all directed towards the Lord Siva. All aim only at the attainment of Siva's bliss in one way or the other. This Dharma is known as Pati Dharma and in this is concluded, the other one. Hence it is that the first three pādams form the Siddhānta for the Karma Kāṇḍa of the Vedas.

9. We shall now turn to see how the Vedānta philosophy corresponds to that of the Āgamānta. The Sivāgamas have already been said to treat of Pati, Paśu and Pāśam. So do the Upanishats also. But these latter do not agree among themselves and this is the reason why one school of philosophers has adopted some only of the Upanishats and another, some others. Srī Saṅkara for instance has adopted ten only of them and class them as Dasopanishats ; while Srī Rāmānuja would adopt some more. These are schools which prefer some Upanishats to the others. Unlike is the case with the Siddhānta school. This regards all the 108 Upanishats as entitled to the same weight and would reconcile them with the Jñānapādas of the Sivāgamas. Take for instance a theory relating to God as to whether He is Saguṇa (having attributes) or Nirguṇa (having no attributes). One and the same Upanishat gives varying texts about it. The sixteenth mantra of the sixth Adhyāya of Svetāśvatara Upanishat recites, "The Lord of Paśu and Pati is one having attributes." While the nineteenth mantra recites, "He has neither forms nor doings. He is quite impersonal." Āgamānta would reconcile them and conclude that He has not got the attributes of a soul. He has not got what are called "ஹேயகுணம்". But He has attributes peculiar to Him which form his "விசேஷகுணம்." Next as to the theory of the individuality of Soul, the Upanishats give conflicting texts. There are what are called Bhedaśrutis and Abhedaśrutis. Texts forming the Bhedaśrutis are found in Upanishats, Bṛihadāraṇya, Svetāśvatara, Muṇḍakopa and others, and the other class of Srutis is found in Chhāndogya and other Upanishats. The Āgamānta would reconcile these and say that Soul is a distinct entity from God, and they exist as not two.

Their existence is co-existence without mutual exclusion. It is this relationship between them that the Āgamānta would style as Advaita relationship. According to this school, the word Advaita does not denote the denial of the existence of any other than God, but denotes the relationship between the two distinct entities of God and Soul. Such conflicting texts are also found in Upanishats as to the theory of Māyā or Aviddai. According to some, it is an entity in itself. According to some others, it is no entity at all. This school would reconcile them and they say that it is not such an unchanging entity like God. It is capable of change. But it is at any rate an entity. Numerous more instances may be quoted. But I have perhaps taken you into details in violation of my promise at the outset. I hope you will bear with me for it. I mean by the instances quoted above that the school of Siddhānta is not one contradicting any of the various other schools that have arisen out of Upanishats ; but one that reconciles the same with the Sivāgamas, with may be said to have arisen out of them both.

10. I have shown that the school of Saiva Siddhānta is not one belonging to any particular caste. It is not Sūdra philosophy as thought of by some of the Brahmins. It is Brahmanic as well as any other. I have also shown that it is not purely Āgamaic ; but Vedic as well, and that it is not Dvaitam as thought of generally, but Advaitam in truth. Nay according to it, the truly Vedic and Advaita philosophy is this one and nothing else. It is also thought of by some that it is purely Tamilian ; as if this school were prevalent only in Tamil Country, and in Tamil language. It is no discredit to any religion that it prevails only in a particular place, or the work bearing on it exists only in a particular language. We are not to test the truth of a philosophy by the place where it prevails or by the language in which it is written. Saint Umāpati has well said, "அன்னிய நூலின்விதிய வாரோத மேலது உ முன்னோல் பழுதொன்றுளாத்து." It is not at the same time true that it prevails merely in Tamil Country. It prevails in north India though to a small extent. It has been found to prevail in Kashmir. The schools of Pratyabhijñā and

Spanda there teach practically the same doctrines as this. It is not at all true that works bearing on this school are written only in Tamil. In fact more works of the school are written in Sanskrit than in Tamil. The every Sivāgamas, which form the basis of this school, exist only in Sanskrit. The fact is, that many of the works in Sanskrit have been left uncared for, to rust and decay; while some others are lying unknown. Some 20 years ago very few thought that there is a Saiva commentary for Brahma sūtras in Sanskrit. It has now become an accomplished fact. It has since been translated into Tamil also by the famous Brahma Srī Sentinātha Iyer to whom the Saiva world is very highly indebted. The very little knowledge I possess of the philosophy of the Upanishats is due to this translation as well as translations of Upanishats appearing in the Light of Truth, the organ of our Samāja. We thus see that this school of Siddhānta is one to which the whole of India can lay claim as its ancestral one.

11. But it must be admitted that this school is at present more flourishing in this Tamil land than elsewhere. This is owing to the advent herein of the four Tamilian Saints whose hymns of Devaram and Tiruvāšagam contain beautiful expositions of philosophical thoughts propounded by this school of philosophy. These hymns correspond to the Vedic hymns; but with this difference that the truths they inculcate are peculiarly Sivaite. Hence it is that the Saiva Siddhāntins regard them as the Tamil Vedas. The rationale of the philosophy is however not discussed therein. It is left entirely to the succeeding group of four other saints, beginning with saint Meykaṇḍān. It was this saint that raised this system to a scholastic one, by his famous work of Sivajñānabodham in Tamil. This work is composed of 12 Sūtras which comprise the whole philosophy. His disciple Saint Aruṇandi has written a Poetic Commentary on the same by his Sivajñāna-siddhi. Then his disciple Saint Maṛaijñānasambandhar, then again his disciple Saint Umāpati wrote similar works. The works of these and two more constitute the fourteen Siddhānta Sāstras in Tamil. The line of disciples continued on like this, and, it is

believed, is still continuing. So that most of the Saiva mutts Saiva priests, great and small, trace their origin to Saint Meykaṇḍān and say they belong Meykaṇḍa santānam.

12. The famous mutt of Tiruvāvaḍuturai is one in the order of Meykaṇḍasantāna mutts. It is famous not merely for the vast wealth it possesses. Great men presided over the mutt and great men were members of the holy order of Tampirāns therein. Saint Sivajñāna Svāmi was one of the holy order some 200 years ago. It was he that wrote the famous prose commentary on Sivajñānabodam in Tamil, known as Drāviḍa Mahā Bāshyam. The whole work is not published yet. The commentary on the last seven sutras alone have been brought to light. I learn that this forms only a third of the whole Bāshyam. But from what has come out, We clearly see what a splendid intellectual treat the Bāshyam supplies, and what a truly great man the swami was. It is said that the mutt possesses the whole Bashyam. It is highly regrettable then that it did not as yet strike His Holiness the present Paṇḍārasannadhi to publish the same. It should not at all be too much to expect, that if the whole Bāshyam is brought out, and translated into English and other important languages, there will come a time when the whole educated world may become the followers of this school.

13. I may perhaps be accused of aspiring too much. Indeed it should appear like that seeing the present condition of our religion. But imagine for a moment what its condition was, some 15 years ago. Few English-cultured men had any scent of it. Our able exponent of this system, I mean our respected President, has brought out his translation of Sivajñābodam in 1895 and his Journal of 'The Light of Truth' soon after. With this may be said to begin the study of this philosophy by the English educated among us. Nay translations of many other Siddhānta works followed in quick succession and also such philosophical Journals like 'The Oriental Mystic Myna.' Besides, Saiva Siddhānta Conferences are being held at various places and lectures on subjects pertaining to the school delivered in English and Tamil. We have formed a Samāja consisting of members throughout this

Presidency. We are issuing tracts and small treatises bearing on this religion. We are also sending out touring lecturers for preaching its truth; men who are truly able exponents of our system have given up their other concerns and consented to go out as Samāja lecturers.

14. Is it then too much that I expected that time may come when our religion and philosophy may spread all through the world? Only we have to acquire a substantial fund for this Provincial Conference to enable us to realise our expectations. At present our work is confined more to our Province. As our fund grows, we should be able to extend our work gradually throughout India and elsewhere all through the world. Svāmi Vivekānanda has paved the way for propagation of our religion in America and other western countries and time will not be far off, when we will follow suit, and in our turn send our Saivaite missionaries all through there. I am perhaps detaining you, gentlemen, with expressions of my fond hopes. I shall not do so any longer. I close my paper here with my heart-felt thanks to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the very patient hearing you have kindly given me.

MARCUS AURELIUS.

Why do unskilled and ignorant souls disturb him who has skill and knowledge?

***

It is a shame for the soul to be first to give way in this life, when thy body does not give way.

***

We are all working together to one end, some with knowledge and design, and others without knowing what they do.

THE ADVAITA PHILOSOPHY.*

The universe or the Jagat, as we may call it in the Vedāntic parlance, has beenthe subject of very serious thought among the philosophers of various nations from a hoary antiquity—What is it? Whence is it? Who produced it? These are questions that engaged the keen attention of ancient philosophers; and these philosophers have bequeathed to us the result of their researches. Their researches led them to the conclusion, in the first place, that there is an Absolute, Infinite, Omnipotent Spirit that governs the universe; and this conclusion led them again to trace the relationship that exists between that Spirit and the Jagat. I will not go into the question whether any knowledge on the subject was revealed to them by that Spirit,—which I will hereafter call God—or whether such knowledge was acquired by them through their own endeavours. It is sufficient for me that they traced the relation between God and Jagat, one way or the other; but in course of time owing to the diversity of human intelligence, there seem to have been different ideas on this subject, and, as a consequence, there were ushered into the world various religions and dogmas. These different religions explain the relation between God and Jagat in different ways, and the ancient Hindu Philosophers themselves, had their own way of explaining this relation. There is, however, ample reason to believe that the philosophy of the Hindus was the earliest among the existing ones; and it is evident that in solving this great problem, they had for their guidance the Vedic revelations, which they considered eternal, in that they embodied the eternal laws of nature.

THE SIX SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

It cannot, however, be said that the Hindus were all agreed in their view on this subject. They were themselves divided in

* A lecture delivered by Mudaliyār S. Sabaratnam before the Vivekānanda Society, Colombo, on the 2nd December 1911.—*Ed. S. D.*

their opinion on this great question, and their thoughts on the subject took six different channels which are now known as the Six Schools of *Shaḍ-Darśana* of the Hindu philosophy. They are:—

1. Vedānta by Vyāsa
2. Pūrvamīmāmsa by Jaimini.
3. Sāṅkhya by Kapila
4. Yōga by Patañjali
5. Vaiśeshika by Kanada and
6. Nyāya by Gautama.

There is some difference in the list of these schools as given by the South Indian Savants, which, however, is not of much concern for my present purpose.

Although these schools differ from each other in a great many material points, it is the opinion of several scholars of Āryan philosophy, such as Vijñāna Bikshu and others, that all these schools are but gradatory steps to the ultimate truth. And Svāmi Vivekānanda expresses himself strongly on this point. This is what he says:—"My mission in life is to shew that the Vedāntic schools are not contradictory, that they all necessitate each other, all fulfil each other, and one, as it were, is the stepping stone to the other until the goal, the Advaita, the *Tattvamasi* is reached."

It will indeed be highly interesting to have some ideas of the theories propounded by these various schools; but I am afraid that it will be out of my province on the present occasion to enter into their teachings. I will confine my remarks to the first in the list, viz., Vedānta which is identical with the subject of my discourse this evening—the Advaita philosophy.

VEDĀNTA.

Vedānta literally means the end or pinnacle of Veda; and the Upanishats, of which there are not less than 108 in number, are popularly known as the Vedānta. All the six schools of Indian philosophy accept invariably the authority of the Upanishats, but they put different constructions on the meaning of these Upanishats to suit their own line of thought. Although

all the six schools were founded on the Upanishats, the school founded by Vyāsa is particularly known as *Vedānta*, and his philosophy is laid down in his immortal work called *Vedānta Sūtram* or *Vyāsa Sūtram*—the aphorisms of Vyāsa. He quotes passages from the Vedas and Upanishats and enunciates his theory which is known as *Vedānta*. This philosophy is greatly admired and appreciated by Western scholars, and it will be interestin gto quote here what the German philosopher Schopanaheur says of it. He says:—

"There is no study more beneficial and elevating to mankind than the study of the Upanishats. It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death".

And Prof. Max Muller is not less jubilant over it. He says:

"If philosophy is meant to be a preparation for a happy death, I know of no better preparation for it than the *Vedānta* philosophy. It is the most sublime of philosophies and the most comforting of religions".

I will give another quotation from an eminent French philosopher—Victor Cousin:—

"When we read the poetical and philosophical monuments of the East—above all those of India—which are beginning to spread in Europe—we discover many a truth—and truths so profound, and which make such a contrast with the meanness of the results at which European genius has sometimes stopped, that we are constrained to bend the knee before the philosophy of the East and to see in this cradle of the human race the native land of the highest philosophy".

Such is the estimation of the *Vedānta* philosophy by Western scholars whose opinion is entitled to great weight owing to their deep researches into Oriental literature.

I must, however, tell you that the *Vedānta Sūtras* which form the basic foundation of the *Vedānta* philosophy are themselves interpreted in different lights. There are four commentaries on these sutras—the earliest of them being by Sri Nīlakaṇṭba Śivāchāryar who was a Śaiva Siddhānta of great eminence.

The second one is by Śrī Śaṅkarāchārya which is generally known as Māyāvāda; the third is by Śrī Rāmānuja who agrees in the main with Śrī Nīlakaṇṭha, but holds that Lord Vishnu is the supreme Deity and the fourth is by Śrī Madvāchārya whose commentary is adhered to by the sect known as ~~or~~ *Madvas*.

So that it is quite apparent that when we speak of *Vedānta* it covers all these four lines of thought, although at present, it is to a great extent mistaken for the *Māyāvāda* of Śrī Śaṅkara —You see what Svāmi Vivekānanda says on this point. He says:—

"This is what I mean by the word 'Vedānta'—that it covers the ground of Dualism, of qualified Monism and Advaitism in India".

PURE VEDĀNTA IS SIDDHĀNTA.

And you could clearly see that *Vedānta* is not an exclusive property of the Māyāvādins, but it is claimed alike by Siddhāntins, Māyāvādins, Vaishnavites and Madvas. *Vedānta* is not at all opposed to Siddhānta, but in fact it is in itself a summary of Siddhānta. Says a Siddhānta saint:

வேதாந்தத் தெளிவாகுஞ் சித்தாந்தம்

and our Lord Tāyumānavar says:

வேதாந்த சித்தாந்த சமரச நன்னிலைபெற்ற வித்தகச் சித்தர் கணம்.

and the great Tirumūlar says:

வேதமொடாகம மெய்யா மிறைவனூல்
ஓதும் பொதுவுஞ் சிறப்பு மென்றுன்னுக
நாதனுரை யிவை நாடிலிரண்டந்தம்
பேதமதென்பர் பெரியோர்க்க பேதமே

and our Kumarakuru puts it beautifully:

ஒரும் வேதாந்த மென்றுச்சியிற் பழுத்த
ஆராவமுதினருங் கனிபிழிந்து
சாரங்கொண்ட சைவசித்தாந்தத்
தேனமுது.

It must be understood that the Šaiva Siddhānta is founded on the 28 Divya *Āgamas* which are considered in the light of special revelations of the Šaivite Creed. It is indeed a great pity that the mine of this religious literature has not yet been explored by Western Savants. It is the religious philosophy propounded by these Āgamas that is known as Siddhāntam or *Šuddhādvika Šaiva Siddhāntam* to qualify it from the philosophy of the Māyāvādins generally known as *Advaita.*

If the word *Advaita* is analyzed and scrutinized, it will be clearly seen that the philosophy known by that name is purely Siddhāntic and not in any way Māyāvādic in its import.

The Māyāvāda interpretation of this philosophy is nothing short of Pantheism, pure and simple, in that it asserts that all Jagat is God. If that be so—if everything is God—where is the necessity for the word *Advaita* to represent that philosophy? *Advaita* means *not two*; but if the whole Jagat is God, why feel diffident to call the God and Jagat one and the same—*Ekam*? The very word *Advaita* is a strong proof that the philosophy is purely Siddhāntic in form, and that the Māyāvādic interpretation is thrusted on it quite inappropriately. According to the Siddhānta philosophy, the relation between God and Jagat (including the Jivas or souls) is so close and so very minutely intimate that it is not possible to separate the one from the other. That is to say, that God is the only absolute being and that all the rest are wholly dependent on Him. The dependence is in no way a partial dependence, or a dependence to any limited extent; but a dependence wholly and fully merging the one into the other. God is the life of the Jagat, and if not for this life, not a particle of this Jagat will be able to show itself. God is the only source and only support of the whole universe, and if not for this primordial basis, if not for this grand granary of the whole material and spiritual world, if nôt for this storehouse of all forces, if not for the strong support of this unsupported vitality, the existence of Jagat cannot be predicated, nor could that existence be ever possible. God is both in and out of the Jagat, or as it were the life and body of the Jagat,

and any form the Jagat assumes, or any movement that is observed in it is all in God—all within his sphere, and all within his sole influence. And we may say that the whole Jagat and Jivas are all comprised in the all-absorbing form or God. However close and intimate the connection between God and Jagat may be, however dependent may be the latter on the former, and however absorbing the influence of God on Jagat —still they are distinct entities and can never be called one and the same, *Ekam*.

It is this intimate union of God and Jagat, and particularly, of God and soul, that is known as *Advaita* relation. The meaning of the word *Advaita is not two. A* means *not* and *dvita* means *two*. That is to say that the God and the souls are not two independent factors, but factors closely united to each other, the one being wholly dependent on the other, so much so, that the existence of the souls cannot be predicated separately. The Siddhānta school calls this relation இரண்டன்மை and it strongly emphasises that it should not be mistaken for இரண்டின்மை. There is a world of difference between the words அன்மை and இன்மை in the Tamil language, and the difference is indeed so subtle and fine that I find it very difficult to express it adequately in English. I may say roughly that the one is the negation of form and the other is the negation of existence. So that God and soul are not two objects in form, but they are two distinct real entities. The gist of Siddhānta philosophy is that soul does not exist apart from God, but that it is fully dependent on God and that the dependence is so full and complete that if you take away God, there would be no souls. This dependence cannot be taken to mean that God and souls are but one and the same.

SIDDHĀNTA.

According to the Siddhānta philosophy God is the essence or Vitality of souls and this is why, in certain places, the Advaita relation is compared to that between body and soul. Surely without soul, there cannot be any action to the body, and in the living state, it is not possible to seperate the one

from the other. It is this relation that we have to realize for our final beatitude, and this realization is the indescribable bliss we are all expected to enjoy in Heaven. It will be preposterous on my part to attempt at any description of the liberated state, but I will touch on the main outline in which it is foreshadowed simply with the object of showing the incongruity of the Māyāvāda theory. In that state, we are expected to realize God in ourselves, to lose ourselves and to merge in the spirit of God. It is not expected that we have to realize that we are God literally. Certainly not. In that case it will be a blasphemy. We cannot for a moment conceive the idea that God as we are, we have been up to the time of liberation, subject to the myriads of worldly infirmities, imperfections and illusions. And, again, if in that liberated state we realize that we have become God, there is something that realizes that state, and we could clearly see there the existence of the soul. But, if no part of our conciousness is to enter into that region, it is no realization at all, but it would amount to the Buddhist theory of annihilation of which I shall speak something later on. So that, Gentlemen, when we test our theory of final beatitude, we could clearly see that that beatitude is the passive realization of our dependence on God by losing our I' ness and My' ness into His Sublime grandeur our existence however not being affected thereby. In the Mukti itself, we are there, in *Advaita* union. Otherwise there would be no Mukti because there is no onc to enjoy it. The *Mahātmas* who attained that state, or who were about to attain that state, sang in their ecstacy that,they did not find themselves, that they saw only God, and that they were merged in his spirit. This seems to have been greatly misunderstood, while in fact they only gave expression to the non-dual relation which they were realizing. It is this relation of close union with God that the Siddhānta school inculcates under the name of *Advaita*.

MĀYĀVĀDA.

This relation of Advaita is expounded at length in the Upanishats, but their arguments have been misconstrued by the

Māyāvādins and misinterpreted by them. Instead of following the arguments from beginning to end in the light in which they were used, they have detached certain portions of those arguments from the main line of reasoning and made use of them in support of a theory quite antagonistic to the spirit of the Upanishats; and in order to maintain their pet theory the Māyāvādins find out some plausible reasons and satisfy their own fancy.

The main contention of the Māyāvādins is that God being omnipresent there cannot be any other object but God, as in that case, it will not be possible for God to occupy the space occupied by that object. This is absurd. This question of space-occupation is only applicable to material objects that have dimensions, such as length, breadth and thickness, and not to spiritual objects like God or soul who have no dimensions of any kind. Any number of these spirits can occupy any space, and their *Vyāpti* or pervasion will not be affected thereby. It is still a greater absurdity to limit the great God to space, while in fact, He is beyond time, space and causation—*Deśa-Kāla-Nimittam.*

If again all the souls and all the the phenomena of the universe are but God Himself, we will have to attribute to Him all the inequalities, impurities and imperfections that we find there. This will be a further absurdity.

I know that when pressed to a corner by the force of such arguments, the Māyāvādins try to take shelter under the theory of illusion, by saying that these phenomena are only illusions and not realities. I will be able to shew presently that this theory of illusion is in itself an illusion ; but before doing so, I must point out that if the *Jagat* is only an illusion and not a reality, the argument that everything is God must be dropped altogether, as God is surely a solid reality and not an illusion in any sense of the word. No illusion can ever be said to be a reality, and it is an idle talk to call the illusory Jagat as the real God.

(To be continued.)

S. S.

The Idea of God viewed in the Light of the Hindu Philosophy.

(Concluded from page 164 of No. 4 Vol. XII.)

To return from the digression—another erroneous supposition, more pernicious than regarding philosophy and religion as different and antagonistic is that the Hindu Religion teaches the worship of many gods and that one can even count them as "thirty-three crores" of gods. Nowhere in the Hindu sacred books, do we find one syllable sanctioning the worship of many gods in the sense that there are many gods, and that they should be appeased for fear of their displeasure. The word "*Devas*" which we meet here and there is derived from the root, "*Div*" = *to shine*, and is used in the sense of "*bright ones*". Says Max Muller in his "Origin and growth of Religion", "when the poets of the Vêda address the mountains to protect them, when they implore the rivers to give them water, they many speak of rivers and mountains as *devas*, but even them though *deva* would be more than *bright* it would as yet be very far from anything we mean by *Divine*." And in the next paragraph he says, "If we could ask Vašishṭha or Višvāmitra or any of the old Āryan poets whether they really thought that the Sun, the golden ball which they saw was a man with legs and arms, with a heart and lungs, they would no doubt laugh at us and tell us that though we understood their language we did not understand their thoughts?" Such is the opinion of him who has made a life-study of the sacred books of the Hindus at their fountain heads; and there is good reason to believe that he is right and that his opinion could be taken as final. Now, coming to the idea of God as contained in the Hindu Philosophy we find Him (1) as the *Causeless First Cause*. In the Ṛig-Veda it is said:

"In the beginning there was neither nought or aught
Then there was neither sky nor atmosphere above.

What then enshrouded all this teeming universe?
In the receptacle of what was it contained?
Was it enveloped in the gulf profound of water?
Then was there neither death nor immortality;
Then was there neither day, nor night, nor light nor darkness,
Only the existent one breathed calmly self-contained.
Nought else, but He there was--nought else above, beyond.
Then first came darkness hid in darkness, gloom in gloom;
Next all was water, all a chaos indiscrete,
In which the one lay void shrouded in nothingness.
Then turning inwards He, by self-developed force,
Of inner fervour and intense abstraction, grew.
First in His mind was formed Desire, the primal germ
Productive, which as the wise, profoundly searching, say
Is the first subtle bond, connecting Entity
And nullity."

The truth embodied in this hymn is explained in the Upanishats by the simile of the spider. Just as the spider draws the threads of its wonderful net out of its own body, so, the world is made not only by God, but also of God. This simile, which is given in the Upanishats to illustrate the meaning of God's being the material as well as the efficient cause of the Universe, led some of the earliest missionaries state that the God of the Hindus was a large black spider which sits in the centre of the universe and creates the world by drawing it out like threads out of its own body. "*Drink deep or taste not the Pierian Spring.*" To venture upon criticism without sound knowledge is a dangerous thing.

Here may arise the question whether God is both the material and efficient cause of the universe. This question has led to hairsplitting discussions between the Siddhāntins and the Vedāntins. But a sage would find no difference between these two schools. Svāmi Tāyumānavar sings thus :—

"வேதாந்த சித்தாந்தம் வேறென்றார் கண்களிக்கும்
நாதாந்த மோன நலமே பராபரமே.

"Thou art, O Parāpara, the Bliss of silence, the End of *Nādam* to those who find no difference between Vedānta and Siddhānta."

That there is and *must be* a first Cause is clearly brought out in the first sutra in Šivajñānabodham:

"அவன் அவள் அதுவெனும் அவை மூவினைமையின்,
தோற்றிய திதியே யொடுங்கி மலத்துளதாம்,
அந்தம் ஆதி எனமனூர் புலவர்."

In Mr. Nallasvāmi Piḷḷai's lucid commentary on Šivajñānabodham, this sūtra is translated as follows:

"As the (seen) universe, spoken of as he, she, and it, undergoes three changes (origin, development and decay), this must be an entity created (by an efficient cause). This entity owing to its conjunction with *Āṇava Mala* has to emanate from *Hara* to whom it returns during *samhāram*. Hence the learned say that *Hara* is the First cause."

(2) We find Him as *Immanent* both in nature and in man. The most celebrated hymn, known as Purusha-sūkta, occurring in the tenth book of the Ṛig Vēda contains the following lines:—

The embodied spirit has a thousand heads
A thousand eyes, a thousand feet, around
On every side enveloping the Earth.
Yet filling space no longer than a span,
He is Himself this very universe;
He is whatever is, has been and shall be;
He is the Lord of Immortality.
All creatures are one-fourth of Him, three-fourths
Are that which is immortal in the sky."

This same grand idea is echoed in the Bhagavat Gitā in the following equally celebrated lines:—

"I am the self in the body of all beings. I am the beginning, the middle and the end of every thing. I am Vishṇu amongst the Ādityas and the all resplendent sun among all shining bodies."

St. Appar sings of God :

" இரு நிலனாய்த் தீயாகி நீருமாகி
இயமானனா யெறியுங் காற்றுமாகி
அருநிலைய திங்களாய் ஞாயிறாகி
ஆகாசமாயட்ட மூர்த்தியாகிப்
பெருநலமுங் குற்றமும் பெண்ணுமாணும்
பிறருருவும் தம்முருவும் தாமேயாகி
நெருநலையா யின்றாகி நாளையாகி
நிமிர்புன் சடையடிகள் நின்றவாறே."

"As earth, Fire, water, Air and Ejaman (of sacrifices) as Moon, the Sun and Ākāš as Ashṭamūrti; as goodness and evil, as male and female, Himself, the form of every form, as yesterday and today and tomorrow, my Lord with the braided hair stands supreme."

Svāmi Tāyumānavar sings :

" அங்கிங்கெனாதபடி யெங்கும் பிரகாசமாய்
* * * * * * * ".

" Not here, not there, but resplendent—everywhere"

" பார்க்குமிட மெங்குமொரு நீக்கமற நிறைகின்ற
பரிபூரணானந்தமே.

"O, perfect Ānanda! who fill'st up all the space
One sees around etc., etc., etc."

St. Māṇikkavāçagar sings:

" நிலம் நீர் நெருப்புயிர் நீள்விசும்பு நிலாப்பகலோன்
புலனாயமைந்தனோடு எண்வகையாய்ப்புணர்ந்து நின்றான்
உலகேழெனத் திசைபத்தெனத் தானொருவனுமே
பலவாகி நின்றவா தோணோக்கமாடாமோ"

"Earth, Water, Air, Fire, Sky, the Sun and Moon
The sentient man, these eight forms He pervades
The seven worlds, Ten quarters, He the one
And many, He stands so, let us sing."

God is not only immanent in nature and in man, but He is at the same time transcendent. This is brought out clearly by the famous "Neti Neti" verse occurring in the Brihadāraṇyaka

Upanishat, which Prañjoti-munivar translates in the following beautiful lines:—

> "பூதங்களல்ல பொறியல்ல வேறுபுலனல்ல வுள்ளமதியின்
> பேதங்களல்லவிவையன்றி நின்ற பிறிதல்லவென்று பெருநூல்
> வேதங்கிடந்து தடுமாறி வஞ்சவெளியென்ப கூடன்மறுகிற்
> பாதங்கணோவ வளையிந்து பகர்வாரையாயுமவரே"

"The sages declare, 'He is not the five elements, not the senses, nor sensations, nor the antaḥkaraṇas, nor the soul;' He is the deceitful nothing which the Vêdas fail to discover."

The second Sūtra in Sivajñānabodham contains in a nutshell, as it were, the relation of God to the World and to the souls—His immanence as well as transcendence. It says,

> "அவையே தானே யாயிருவினையின்
> போக்கு வரவுபுரிய ஆணையின்
> நீக்கமின்றி நிற்குமன்றே."

"He is one with the soul's (Abedha). He is different from them (Bedha). He is one and different from them (Bedhābedha). He stands in samavaya union with His Jñānasakti, and causes the souls to undergo the processes of evolution (births) and return (samhāram) by including their good and bad acts (karma)"—*Mr. Nallasvāmi Piḷḷai.*

3. We find Him both as *Nirguṇa and Saguṇa*: *Nirguṇa* means above the three *Guṇas Sattva, Rajas*, and *Tamas*: *Saguṇa* means with the *Guṇas*. God as *Nirguṇa* is beyond the comprehension of man. But God as *Saguṇa* engages in the creation, preservation and dissolution of the Universe, and in that aspect, and in it alone, He is comprehensible by man. It is in this sense that the Vedāntins speak of a Higher Brahman and a Lower Brahman. But in fact there is no difference between the two. Says Max Muller in the "Vedānta Philosophy": "with regard to the subjects taught in the Upanishats, it was the highest aim of the ancient Vedānta Philosophers to show that what we might call the exoteric Brahman was substantially the same as the esoteric, that there was in reality, and that there could be one Brahman only, not two." And yet, it was necessary, that

there should be a qualified Brahman, for continues he: "Thus they distinguish between the qualified (saguṇa) and the unqualified (aguṇa) Brahman, and they allow a qualified Brahman for all practical purposes (vyavahāra), and more particularly for the purpose of worship (upāsana), because in a state of worship the human mind requires a qualified and objective God, a God the Father or the creator, though that Father can be a person only, a pratika or face, as the Brahmans call it, of the Divine substance, using the same simile of face, persona or person, which is well known to us from the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. Thus Brahman may be worshipped as Īśvara or Lord, as a conditioned personal God and yet be known as in His substance high above all conditions and limits inherent in personality."

The reason why the Higher Brahman becomes the Lower Brahman or Īśvara is for the sake of man who cannot realise and worship God as *Nirguṇa*. Accordingly He assumes different forms out of His supreme love to save erring humanity from the bonds of Malam, or corruption.

Thus, we find in the Taittirīya Upanishat,

> " His head is surely Love; joy His right wing; delight His left,
> Bliss is His self, Brahman whereon He rests."

With this we can compare these famous lines,

> " அன்பும் சிவமு மிரண்டென்ப ரறிவிலார்
> அன்பே சிவமாவ தாருமறிந்திலார்
> அன்பே சிவமாவ தாருமறிந்தபின்
> அன்பே சிவமா யமர்ந்திருந்தாரே."

> "The ignorant say Love and God are different
> None know that Love and God is the same
> When they know that Love and God is the same
> They rest in God as Love."

The different forms which God as Saguṇa or Lower Brahman assumes are not material, but purely spiritual and cannot be perceived without His infinite Love, and when perceived cannot be described in words.

Sings St. Appar :

"மைப்படிந்த கண்ணாளும் தானுங் கச்சி
மயானத்தான் வார்சடையான் பாசொன்றில்லான்
ஒப்புடைய னல்லன் ஒருவனல்லன்
ஓரூரனல்லன் ஒருவனில்லி
யப்படியன் அவ்வுருவன் அவ்வண்ணத்தான்
அவனருளே கண்ணாகக் காண்பதல்லால்
இப்படியன் இவ்வுருவன் இவ்வண்ணத்தான்
இவனிறைவ னென்றெழுதிக் காட்டொணாதே".

"The Lord with the braided hair lives in the Kañchi burial-ground with His beautiful Umā with pencilled eye-brows. He has no sin. He is not one of the mortals and is not to be compared with any of them. He has no place and is incomparable unless we can with His grace as our eye perceive Him, His form and nature; none can paint Him in His real form and nature."

Sings Kāraikkāl Ammāiyār, a saint and poetess :

"அன்றும் திருவுருவம் காணாதே யாட்பட்டேன்
இன்றும் திருவுருவம் காண்கிலேன்—என்றுந்தான்
எவ்வுருவோ நும்பிரானென்பார்கட் கென்னுரைப்பேன்
எவ்வுருவோ நின்னுருவமேது."

When thy slave I first became thy form I did not know,
Thy form, even now, I have not seen,
To those who ask me what Thy form is, what am I to say ?
What is thy form? Which is it ? None.

Sings Svāmi Tāyumānavar :

அன்பைப் பெருக்கி யெனதாருயிரைக் காக்கவந்த
இன்பப் பெருக்கே யிரையே பராபரமே".

O, Parāpara, my love to increase and soul redeem
Thou hast come as my Spring of Bliss and Love supreme.

4. We find Him as *Sat-Chit-Ānanda.* Sat denotes pure Being, Chit pure Love or Aruḷ, and Ānanda pure Bliss. Accordingly God is defined in brief as Sat-Chit-Ānanda. In the Taittiriya Upanishat there is a beautiful story which shows at once what God is and how He could be known :—Brihu went to his father

Varuṇa, and asked him, "Father, make known to me Brahma (the Supreme one)." The venerable Varuṇa replied: "That whence all beings are produced,—by which they live when born,—that towards which they tend,—and that into which they pass, do you seek that; for That is Brahma." Brihu meditated in devout contemplation, and having meditated profoundly, he recognised "Food" (matter) to be Brahma: for all beings are produced from "Food," when born they live by "Food," towards "Food" they tend, and they pass into "Food." With this he was not satisfied. So, he again went to his father, and asked him, "Father, make known to me Brahma." His father replied, "Seek Him by deep meditation." He meditated again deeply, and found "Life" to be Brahma; for all beings are produced from "Life," when born they live by "Life;" towards "Life" they tend; and into "Life" they pass. But still he was not satisfied, so, he again went to his father and asked, "Father, make known to me Brahma." "Seek Him by deep meditation", was the reply. He meditated again and found "Intellect" to be Brahma, for all beings are produced by "Intellect", when born they live by "Intellect", towards "Intellect" they terd, and they pass into "Intellect." But he was not satisfied. So, he went to his father for the fourth time and asked him, "Father, make known to me Brahma." "Seek Him by meditation", was the reply. He meditated again and found "Ānanda" (Sat-Chit-Ānanda) to be Brahma, for all things are produced from "Ānanda," when born they live by "Ānanda", they tend towards "Ānanda," they pass into "Ānanda."

Thus by long-continued, persevering and prayerful meditation Brihu was able to find God as Sat-Chit-Ānanda.

The Sat-Chit-Ānanda God possesses eight attributes.

Says St. Vaḷḷuvar:

"கோளில் பொறியிற் குணமிலவே யெண்குணத்தான்
றாளை வணங்காத் தலை."

"Before His foot 'the Eight fold Excellence' with unbent head
Who stands like palsied sense, is to all living functions dead."

The eight attributes of God are 1. self-existence, 2. essential purity, 3. intuitive wisdom, 4. infinite intelligence, 5. essential freedom from all bonds, 6. infinite grace or love, 7. omnipotence, 8. infinite enjoyment or bliss.

It is the duty of every man to contemplate on these attributes of God so that he may grow more and more like Him till he can find Him "closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet." O! What a joy would it be then! What a happiness! What a blessing! Passing description. Only to be known by realisation.

Says St. Tirumūlar:

"தூக்கிக் கண்டார் சிவலோகமும் தம்முளே
தூக்கிக் கண்டார் சிவயோகமும் தம்முளே
தூக்கிக் கண்டார் சிவபோகமும் தம்முளே
தூக்கிக் கண்டார் நிலை சொல்வதெவ்வாறே."

"They slept and in themselves realized Siva Loka,
They slept and in themselves realized Šiva Yoga,
They slept and in themselves realised Šiva Bhoga,
They slept and how can we realise their Sleep?"

Says St. Valluvar:

"இருணீங்கி யின்பம் பயக்கு
மருணீங்கி மாசறு காட்சி யவர்க்கு"

"Darkness departs, and rapture springs to men who see
The mystic vision pure, from all delusion free."

St. John the divine, says:

"And, I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea."

To realise this "luminous sleep," this "mystic vision," this "new heaven", we require the grace of God. Unless "with His grace as our eye" we see Him, we can never realise Him. May His grace therefore be upon every one of us and rest with us now and for ever more!

R. R. G.

Saiva Siddhanta Maha Samaja.

The first lecturing tour for the year 1912 of Svāmi Vedāchalam:—

Svāmi Vedāchalam, the chief lecturer of the Samāja went to Vellore on the 17th January 1912, to deliver lectures and make all necessary arrangements for holding the seventh conference of the Samāja there.

On the 21st January, a lecture on the historicity of Saint Tirujñānasambandha was delivered by him in the spacious hall of Tirunāvukkarasu Swamigal mutt. At the end of the lecture the lecturer requested the audience to attend the private meeting to be held on the 22nd to concert measures for conducting the seventh conference of the Samāja at Vellore in December, 1912.

On the 22nd evening all the interested and influential persons of the town attended the private meeting and at the request of those present the Svāmi took the chair. First it was proposed to form a local Śaiva Siddhānta Sabhā as a branch to the mother society. And the proposal was unanimously carried out. The Sabhā was accordingly formed with Mr. Nādamuni Mudaliyār, Retired Sub-assistant Inspector of Schools, as President and Messrs. Rājavelu Mudaliyār, B.A., Pleader, and Appādurai Mudaliyār, Contractor as Honorary Secretaries.

On the 25th January, another lecture was arranged under the auspices of the newly formed Siddhānta Sabhā and the Svāmi delivered his able lecture on 'Samarasa Sanmārga'. At the end of the lecture the Svāmi made a formal announcement of the newly formed Śaiva Siddhānta Sabhā and impressed on the minds of the people the necessity for their co-operation. Then the list of members forming the Local Committee for conducting the Seventh Conference of the Samāja was read by the Secretary. Mr. Nādamuni Mudaliyār was appointed as the President and Messrs. Rājavelu Mudaliyār, B.A., Pleader and Śivaśaṅkara Mudaliyār, Pleader, were appointed Joint Secretaries.

Again on the 28th January, the Svāmi delivered an inspiring lecture on 'Vegetarianism'. The audience was so much touched by the pathos and eloquence of the lecture that many swore at the spot to abstain from the animal food from that moment and stick to vegetable food all throughout their life.

The Svāmi's stay at Vellore for twelve days had been very beneficial to the people. In his private conversation with the learned and influential persons of the town, he had occasion to enlighten them on the broad, all-embracing and unsectarian religion and philosophy of Śaiva Siddhānta, and correct their prejudices against it. After knowing the truth and catholic principles of Śaiva Siddhānta, many Saivites, Vaishṇavites and others became members to the Samāja. In this way nearly a hundred persons have been enlisted as members and twenty-six of them have already paid their subscriptions.